



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,287	12/12/2001	Michael Black	RLT-111/US	1768
23419	7590	10/12/2004	EXAMINER	
COOLEY GODWARD, LLP 3000 EL CAMINO REAL 5 PALO ALTO SQUARE PALO ALTO, CA 94306			SHAY, DAVID M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/017,287	Applicant(s) BLACK, MICHAEL	
	Examiner david shay	Art Unit 3739	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-12, 16-23, 25-35, 38-41, 43-53 and 55-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 57-68 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-12, 16-23, 25-35, 38-41, 43-53, 55, 56, 69 and 70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Newly submitted claims 57-68 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the above claims are drawn to a computer readable medium containing a set of instructions as such this is an educational device classified in class 434 subclass 262 and is a subcombination usable together with the method of use and apparatus of claims 1-3, 6-12, 16-23, 25-35, 38-41, 43-3, 55, 56, 69, and 70, the educational materials of claims 57-68 being usable with a non-mirror based system.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 57-68 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

The “cross referencing” to applications 10,020,270 is noted.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-3, 6-12, 16, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 30-35, 38, 39, 43, 45-51, 55, 69 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black et al ('740) in combination with Sugiyama et al. Black et al ('740) teach a device and method as claimed including the spot size, but does not discuss the source of the different laser wavelengths applied at all once. Sugiyama et al teach that multiple lasers can be used to produce simultaneous beams of differing frequencies. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ the applicator of Black et al ('740) in the apparatus and method of Sugiyama et al, since this will direct all the laser wavelengths to the same spot, and enables the use of smaller spot sizes, as taught by Black et al (740) or to employ the device and method of Sugiyama et al in the device and method of

Art Unit: 3739

Black et al ('740) since Black et al ('740) give no structure to apply different beams all at once, thus producing a device such as claimed.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-12, 16, 24-26, 28, 30-35, 43, 45-51, 69, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumoulin – White et al in combination with Black et al ('740). Dumoulin – White et al teach a device such as claimed except the use of a mirror device, the spot size and scanning the beam. Black et al ('740) teach the use of a mirror based focusing device that produces the claimed spot size and scans the beam. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ the device and method of Black et al ('740) in the device and method of Dumoulin – White et al, since this would locate the various wavelength of laser light at the same point, thus producing a device and method such as claimed.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, 16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 30-35, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45-51, 53, 69, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freiberg in combination with Black et al ('740). Freiberg teaches device on claimed except the mirror based device, the spot size, and scanning. Black et al ('740) teach the use of a mirror based device to form a spot size as claimed which can be scanned. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ the device and method of Black et al ('740) in the device and method of Freiberg, since this would effectively combine the different wavelengths and project them at the same spot, as taught by Black et al ('740) or to employ the sources and beam combiners of Freiberg in the device of Black et al ('740) since Black et al ('740) describes no structure for applying different color beams all at once, thus producing a device and method such as claimed.

Claims 1, 18, 28, 29, 31, 40, 45, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freiberg in combination with Black et al ('740) as applied to claim 1-3, 6-8,

Art Unit: 3739

10-12, 16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 30-35, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45-51, 53, 69, and 70 above, and further in view of Black et al ('936). Black et al ('936) teach the use of a micromanipulator as an input for an endoscope. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ the micromanipulator of Black et al ('936) in the device of Freiberg, since this is an appropriate control device for an endoscope, as taught by Black et al ('936) or to include the beam combiner of Freiberg in the device of Black et al ('936), since this allows multiple treatments with a single instrument as taught by Freiberg and to construct the device in the claimed dimensions, since this would render the device such as claimed.

Claims 1, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freiberg a combination with Black et al ('740) as applied to claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, 16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 30-35, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45-51, 53, 69, and 70 above, and further in view of Dew. Dew teaches removing optical components from the optical path by rendering the location that the optical component resides in no longer a part of the optical path. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ the optical path combining device of Dew in the device of Freiberg, since Freiberg discloses no particular mechanism to accomplish the superposition of beams, thus producing a device such as claimed.

Claims 1, 26, 27, 31, 43-45, 53 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freiberg as combination with Black et al ('740) as applied to claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, 16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 30-35, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45-51, 69 and 70 above, and further in view of Kittrell et al. Kittrell et al teach an apparatus for and method of the use of fluorescence maps for diagnosing tissue to locate tissue that is suitable for removal. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ the diagnostic system of Kittrell et al in the system of Freiberg

Art Unit: 3739


since this can locate the tissue requiring treatment and prevent the treatment of healthy tissue as taught by Kittrel<sup>l</sup> et al or to include the multiple laser system of Freiberg in the device of Kittrel<sup>l</sup> et al, since this would allow treatment of both hard and soft tissue, as taught by Freiberg, thus producing a device such as claimed. *2*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6-12, 16-23, 25-35, 38-41, 43-53, 55, 56, 69 and 70 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to David Shay at telephone number 308-2215.

  
**DAVID M. SHAY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 330**